G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1890

~~191~~

(LR)

File No. 20-1890

Serial Nos. 1-6

Later references.

R. M 425 of 1892
and
241 of 1892.

(34)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-16

Major Part-B for Jan 93.

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Venkatà narana bhatta the agent of Melhalli &c Villages Commanded by the Hemagiri Channel.

W D 68—GPB—50,000—24-1-16

96/

Indexed
HF
Counter...

(32)

Memo

In order to facilitate the collection of contribution payable by the holders of Bonhalli & 6 other inam villages towards the upkeep of the Hemagiri channel, the inam village of Yachamanahalli was placed under Govt management in 1867. It still continues to be so. The administration of Yachamanahalli was reviewed in Govt: Rv: no: 3793-3802* dated 17th July 1890. In para 5 of these Rop: the Dy: Comr: was directed to submit annual statements of receipts & expenditure as ordered once before. This order does not appear to have been complied with.

* L.R. 198 of 1888-89 - 585 - cir: 67

Venkatramanaya one of the vittidars was appointed agent in 1876 for Yachamanahalli Melkalli & 11 other inam villages with the consent

2

of the remaining Vettidars.

Petitioner Venkata
ramanabhatta —
a Vettidar of the
Inam village of Mel-
halli now Complains
that the agent has
kept him out of
the informations &
accounts of the Inam
village; that the agent
deceived him by
giving him false accounts,
& that he (agent) has
not been discharging
the duties satisfactorily

In answer to an
enquiry made
by Comr: report that
the Jamabandi of
Yachamanahalli
which is under Govt:
management is being
done properly every
year, that the Mel
Inam village including
Melhalli, of which the
Petitioner is a Vettidar,
are under the manage
ment of the Inamdars
& the Govt officials do not
interfere with them,
& that in the interests
of the Inamdars the
present agent should

× vide Hon Offrs
no: 854 dy 9-7-95

be removed, no agent being necessary for the village under Govt: management & and the Inamdars being allowed to appoint another person as agent for their village

With his docket no: 530 dated 26th October 1889 the Dy Comr submitted the statement shewing the demand, Collection & Balance and Expenditure concerning the village of Yachamanahalli of last year it has been taken under Govt: management upto & inclusive of 1887-88. He now furnishes statements for the subsequent years 1888-89 & 1889-90 The opening balance in the statement for 1888-89 does not tally with the closing balance of 1887-88. The difference is pointed out in the margin. This requires explanation from the remarks

1887-88 - Closing Bal — 1750
1888-89 Op 95 - 2202

Differenn 452

4

Made in the Statement for 1889-90; the Chairman & the Patel appear to have misappropriated certain sums of money.

Minute

Submitted to the Council

27/5/92

27/5/92

Bn Mp Case Chiefs Cos orders absent as Agent being appd for Dharwar Villages by both sides of the yard, by York. (One of the principal orders examined Thimbo by Col Sheriff Clarke & another by Mr Ringachariar)

Attd 1/6

+ Purpose of this Enquiry?)

The Agent having been asked by Govt. it seems due that the local officers should examine the accounts and get them prepared 1892 - At present he has not the means for instituting any kind of criminal prosecution. Prov. of any delinquency. Why the Subordinate Officers should not be called upon to explain the discrepancies & the Accountant to examine & the accounts

Attd 26/12

For Mr Devereux orders

Attd 26/12

The Collector by order of Govt marked the former Asst must act as Interpreter to Govt Offrs. The proper case must be filed & from the Collr Offrs of Govt & they will take down the evidence of the witnesses & Asst Commr should not be present at the depositions in the case & call for explanation

Mr Ramachandra Rao

Asst

Attd 30/12

Received 28/12

31/12/92

To

Received
Camp Kadaipur No 26
5-1-94

No
2243

19-12-93

K. Shreshadri Esqr C.S.I.

Dewan Bahadoor to

H. H. ~~The Maha Raja~~



The humble petition of Venkata Narana Bhatta Vrittidar of the Sarvamanya village, Mellahalli, Attikuppah taluk, residing in Devamba Agra Mysore himbly Showeth:—

That in 1876 the Government appointed one Venkatramanya as Agent to manage the affairs of the said Mellahalli and other Sarvamanya villages watered by the Hema gire Channel, on Security of Rs 2000 for the proper performance of his duties as stated in the Circular (Para IV) No 3237 — 19 of 187 issued by the Chief Commissioner of Mysore he is paid Rs 15 per month out of the Revenue of Madyaka Yachamana halli which is under the Government management

2. That as the said Venkatramaya failed to carry out his duties, gave me false accounts and misappropriated a portion of the revenue of the said village I filed a criminal suit against him in the Court of the Sub division Magistrate, French Rocks in 1885. The Case was referred to the first class Magistrate, Mysore. Since the Magistrate did not properly enquire into the case, I presented a petition to the District Magistrate, Mysore requesting him to decide the case. The then District Magistrate Mr. T. Ananda Rao passed orders in the Crim. Mis. No 27 of 1888, and sent down the papers to the Sub Division. Officer to examine the accounts of the Village and try the case on the Revenue Side.

3 I beg to invite respectfully your honour's attention to the opinion of the District Magistrate on my unfortunate case as expressed in his orders above alluded to

"The case consists practically of an examination of the accounts from Vishu (1881-82)
After the best endeavours to understand and apprise the situation the only conclusion at which I can arrive is that petitioner's is a hard case, that if he is not defrauded of money he has, at least, been kept out of the informations, explanations, and accounts which it is the duty of the Agent and the Shanbogue of the village to afford, and that the Agent and the Shanbhogue have not satisfactorily met the Complainants allegations. ..... The Agent was appointed or recognised by the Government and holds his office in a manner on Government Support. In the public interest, it behoves the Sub Divisional Officer to hold the Jamabandi of the Village this season to strike the accounts up to date and allow the Complainant a free examination of them."

4. But the Sub Division Officer without holding the Jamabandi of the Village as directed by the District Magistrate sent down the papers to the Amildar of the Attikuppa Taluk. But the latter too did not

examine the accounts, but got a Summary of the accounts produced by the Agent and included it into the papers of the case. I my again submitting a petition to the Deputy Commissioner stating that the Amildar did not examine the accounts, the Magistrate ordered him to carry out his former orders. The Amildar having taken down the particulars of the Agent and myself, sent up the papers to the District Magistrate. Though the Agents' faults and deceitful transactions were proved before the Amildar, the District Magistrate did not pay his attention to them, and endorsed my petition directing me to the Civil Court to recover the money.

6 I beg your honor's kind attention to the following chief points of the case:-

(a) In the above said Summary, the Agent mentions every year from 1880-81 to 1888-89 certain sums of money under a heading 'Kiháyari' (balance on hand). He has not at all mentioned

tioned these sums in the Account Patti marked (C) herewith produced which the Agent gave me. The following Comparison between the Summary and the Patti will convince your honour that the Agent has deceived me by giving me false accounts

For the year Vishu (1881-82)

	Summary			Patti		
	Rs	As	P	Rs	As	P
Balance of the previous year	317	2	10	56	14	4
Jamabandi of the Current year	396	4	"	396	4	"
Total	713	6	10	453	2	4
Local expenses	69	9	10	59	11	4
Paid to the Petitioner	86	"	"	80	"	"
Balance	244	4	6	76	9	"

Thus there is a great difference between the Patties given to me by the Agent and the said Summary he has produced to the Court. He did not inform me of these 'Kirajari' accounts. Now, as he was compelled to submit the accounts to the Government, he has adopted this mask of Kirajari to conceal his misappropriation of the village revenue

(b) On seeing the accounts 'Khate' and 'Khirdi' produced by the Agent before the Amildar that I came to

to know that from Vishu (1881-82)
he did not pay us, the Vrittidars, the
revenue of the village as soon as it
was collected. That at times of payment
he did not pay the whole amount col-
lected up to the day but paid us
only a portion of it and retained the
rest and at no time of payment
he has paid us the whole amount
he had collected. Moreover, he
has not produced vouchers for
all the amounts which he states, as
paid, in the accounts.

In the year Vyaya (1886-87),
although he had on hand more than
Rs 116 from July, yet in October
he paid me only Rs 12 and Rs 20
to another Vrittidar keeping the rest
with himself. He has kept with him-
self a sum not less than Rs 115 and
sometimes even approaching to Rs 370
for a period of a year and eight
months (from Jan: /87 to Aug/88),
And a sum of Rs 200 for a period
of one year (from March /89 to March/9
All these will be clear by the 'Statement
of Accounts' herewith produced

In Government villages if the
Shanbogue or the Shekadar were to
commit a slight mistake in the accounts

or retain a small sum after submitting Iratal, the Government would consider these as punishable faults. While this is the case, the Deputy Commissioner has left the Agent unpunished though he is appointed by the Government and has given false accounts and has kept with himself large sums of money for long periods

By, mail with the annexures received 25/3/91

(c) The petitioners and three others are the Vrittidars of the said Mahal. The lands are not devided but they are equal Co-sharers to the revenue of the village. The Agent has not distributed the revenue among them according to their proper shares.

	Srigam Bhatta			The Petitioner			Shashiengar			Chickanick		
Parthiva (1885-86)	110	"	"	60	"	"	112	8	"	40	"	"
Vyaya (1886-87)	36	"	"	12	"	"	47	"	"	131	9	8
Sarvajith (1887-88)	126	"	"	60	4	"	93	"	"	"	"	"
Total Rs	272	"	"	132	4	"	252	8	"	171	9	8

(Vide the Statement)

The above table will clearly show your honor that the Agent every year has distributed the revenue among the equal Co-Sharers in unequal proportions just as he liked This will be obvious from his own summaries

(d) In the said village a cattle-pound was in existence for a time. Not only Jondi-julmjana was collected but also several head of cattle impounded were sold in public auction. The Agent has admitted before the Amildar that these things were carried out in his presence. But he has entirely left out this item from the accounts of the village and has altogether misappropriated the amount so collected.

(e) Further, your honor will be convinced of his negligence in performing his duties by the fact that though the Annual Jamabandi itself is about Rs 716. he has left a balance of Rs 1100 to be collected from the ryots

There are but a few of his negligencies and deceitful transactions which are too many to be enumerated here. He has caused a considerable loss to me but Mr. T. Nikle John the Deputy Commissioner was not pleased to consider the case well and to do me justice. This Vritti is the only means of my subsistence. The long delay in disposing the case has made me almost destitute as the Agent purposely injures my interest

Therefore I beg your honour to send for and examine the papers and reach

me justice by redressing my grievances.

For which act of kindness, I shall ever pray

Dated 2nd Dec/90 } ਦਸ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਦਸੰਬਰ ੯੦ ਈ:

List of the papers herewith Submitted.

1 Orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner.
(referred to in Paras 2 & 3.)

2 Endorsement No. 415 by the present Deputy Comm.

3 Account Patti marked (6) — the original one being among the previous papers.

4 Authenticated copy of the Summary produced by the Agents
(referred to in para 6 (a) & (d)

5. Statement of Accounts according to 'Khate' & 'Khiradi'

Camp ✓ Serial 2
No: 854



~~Memorandum~~

The accompanying petition of Venkatnarnabhat Vrittidar of the Sarvamanyam village of Melhalli in the Attikuppa Taluk, is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, for early report.

2. The circumstances under which an Agent was appointed by Government ^ security being taken from him for the proper conduct of his duties should be ~~reported~~ stated.

the village was taken under Govt management and

^ & whether it is still necessary to continue the village under Govt management

3. In view of the responsibilities which the appointment of such an Agent entails upon Government the Deputy Commissioner will

Explain

explain whether in his opinion, it is necessary any longer to continue it.

4. ~~While~~ So long as ~~it~~ the Village remains under Govt management ~~subsists~~, it is the duty of the Revenue Officers of Government to see ~~that~~ the Agent performs his duties and fulfils the purposes of his appointment adequately and faithfully. The Govt apprehend ~~Devas fears~~ that this has not been done in the past and ~~that~~ the Agent has had too much his own way.—

5. The ~~Sub Divisional~~ Officer should hold the Jamabandi of the villages under the management

The Dy Comr is requested to obtain a statement showing the demand, collections & balance of the ryots under Govt management from the date they have been taken under management on account

management of the Agent and submit a report to the Deputy Commissioner which the Deputy Commissioner will submit to Govt with such remarks as may be called for. The report should, among other things, distinctly show the Demand Collection & Balance of the villages under all heads of revenue and there should be a separate account explaining the manner in which the collections have been appropriated.

6. From the statement marked No. 5 and annexed to the petition which local Officers have evidently accepted without demur it appears that the Agent has

of the disbursements — It should also be stated whether the Landholders of the Villages has ever been made by Govt. Officers & if not why? —

I think it is too soon to ask Govt to depend the agent. Let us have a report & we can then consider what orders should be issued

27/12/92

has been mixing up the Jamabandi account and his account with the Vrittidars - This is irregular. As it stands, the amounts shown as "Balance in hand" on the credit side, have yet to be accounted for. The Agent should be called upon to furnish the necessary explanations; and if no satisfactory explanation is promptly forthcoming, he should be suspended from Office pending further inquiry. Either the Deputy Commissioner or the Sub Division Officer should conduct the

the necessary inquiries personally, the attendance of the Agent, the Petitioners being secured and such other writtidars as may choose to attend being afforded an opportunity of doing so.

By Order

Chief Secy

5

To the same No. 1050 dt 24/12/91
from the same No. 1710 dt 24/5/91

No 854

Draft

Submitted to Mr. Chentsal
Rao Pantulugaru as
desired by the Chf. Secy
Today.
22/12/90

22439/90

See my remarks &
alterations within

22/12/90

L.D. 24th inst
24/12

P.T.O.

5

Serial 3 Diary No. 1703 / P. 15 14

No. 171

Deputy Commissioners Office
Mysore District LB
Section
Dated Mysore the 22 March 1890
Serial No 3

From,

D. Nanacnd Row Esquire
Offg Deputy Commissioner

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

In reply to your official Memorandum No 854 dated 9th January 1891, I have the honor to report as follows:-

2 All the Inam villages, viz 13 in number forming endowment to the Devamba Agrahar have not been taken under Government management. Only one village named Maddika Yachamanhalli is under Government management for recouping the cost of the repairs of the Hemagiri Channel which irrigates a portion of the Inam villages. This arrangement will have to continue, because the Inamdars have made over the revenue of the village for the purpose, receiving only the surplus after defraying the cost of

1. Basavanhalli
2. Madvankode
3. Yachenahalli
4. Melhalli
5. Koranenahalli
6. Dadahalli
7. Machavalalu
8. Seranenahalli
9. Mabhalli
10. Hambadi
11. Bandhole
12. Idagunahalli
13. Yachamanhalli

the channel repairs.

3. The Agent, Venkatramiah, who is one of the Vrittidars, was appointed in 1876 for all the villages with the consent of the remaining Vrittidars. He has furnished security for the proper performance of his duties, but it is clear from the records that he has not acquitted himself properly in his work.

4. The accounts of the Maddika Yacha manhalli village from 1866-67 to 1887-88 have already been submitted to Government with this Office No. 1204 dated 9th Janv: 1891. The Sub Division Officer promises to submit, at an early date, the accounts for the remaining years, which will be duly forwarded on receipt.

5. The Jamabundy of the village, which is under Government management is being done properly every year; but the other Inam villages being under the management of the Inamdars, the Government officials do not interfere with them.

6. In the interests of the Inamdars, I think, the present Agent should be removed from his office. If the Inamdars so prefer they may appoint any other person in his place. I am of opinion that no Agent is necessary so far as the village under Government management is concerned. The Taluk authorities will manage its affairs just as those of Sirkar villages.

7. The appeal petition received with the above memorandum is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

D Muncal Rao
Offg Dep. Commissioner
Mysore Dist

Serial 4

(General Serial No. 30).

8

1891.

17

From The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

To The Deputy Commr. Mysore District

Section LR

File No 30 of 1890

Serial No 1891 4

Dated 12

Despatched 14th January

Received

Enclosures No.

General No 2966 R

No 56

To the same No 5613 dt 31st/1891 P.116

To the same No 8966 dt 12th/91 P.182

To the same No 1139 dt 21st/91

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No 171 dated 22d Ultimo reporting on the petition from Venkatarama Bhatt, Vrittidar of Melhalli, Attikuppe Taluk

---

With reference to the above, has the honor to state that no accounts were received with his No 1204 dt 9th January/1891, and to request the early submission of the same. But if they have been subsequently submitted, requests that the number and date of the communi-cation may be quoted.

By Order

Draft

Under Secretary

AG

Serial 15

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
12860
23 MAR. 92
P.108 1001

From
Secretary The Deputy Commissioner
File No 36 of 1890-91 District
Serial No 5
To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Bangalore

Dated 21st March
Despatched 22 March
Received

Enclosures No. Two

351
General No. 1139
No.

With reference to his docket No. 2966 dated 12th June 1891, has the honor to submit herewith the accounts relating to Maddikayachanahally Village, in the Krishnarajpet Taluq, as called for in the above.

Krishnayya
For Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Compare ally.

MM

Ref. Mr. 2373

Asst to Dy Comr

31/3/92

Above Mail in this Office Memo No. 854 of 9.1.91. The Dy Com was required to submit a Statement showing the Demand, Collection & Balance of this Village under Govt management from the Date it has been taken under Govt: management & an account of the Disbursements - This has not been done. But statements for 1888-89 & 89-90 only have been submitted. The Dy Com in para 4 of his letter no. 171 of 22nd May 91 stated that accounts for 86-87 & 87-88 had been submitted with his no 1204 of 9.1.91. But no accounts & hearing been

A3
28-3-92

19

received accordingly
Attention was drawn
to this fact in this
office No. 2966. of
12th June 1891. and
this is the reply
received with accts
for the 2 years
referred to above.

In the Colo Col:
remarks in the
statement for 89-90
Certain misappro-
priations are
alluded to. & the
information furnished
is meagre.

A draft may
be prepared as above requesting the Dy Com to
send in accounts completely together with a report
in detail
submitted for
approval.

21/3/92

Please prepare a
draft for subn. to Chf. Secy
Mark 1/4.

Subd. with a draft for appl.
Mark 5/4/92

Brought all these
papers forward for
file heading up to
Bom. 5793. of 17/July 90
97

31

Statement shewin

No:	Items:-	Demand (Jamabundy). Balance at the end of march 1888.			Jamabundy for 1888-89.		
1.	Land.	2087.	6.	11.	1895.	12.	..
2.	Amaraje.	8.	4.	..	5.	9.	..
3.	Mohaturfa.	7.	..	..	3.	..	..
4.	Hullbunni.	1.	..	..	1.	..	..
5.	Tax.	98.	14.	9.	119.	4.	10.
6.	Miscellaneous.	..	..	..	10.	..	..
7.	Water cess	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Total	2202	9.	8.	2034.	9.	10. 4

Camp Nundya
Date 10 March
1892

g Receipts and Disbursements of Muddiña Yathamanikalli Krishnaraj

Collection														
Total			Arrears.			Current.			Total			Arrears.		
3983.	2.	11.	888.	9.	1.	998.	6.	4.	1886.	15.	5.	1198.	13.	10.
13.	13.	..	5.		..	5.	9.	..	10.	9.	..	3.	4.	..
10.	..	..	7.	..	..	3.	..	..	10.	..	..	..	..	..
2.	..	..	..	7.	10.	..	9.	4.	1.	1.	2.	..	8.	2.
218.	3.	7.	22.	11.	7.	69.	7.	4.	92.	2.	11.	76.	3.	2.
10.	..	..	..	..	..	10.	..	..	10.	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
237.	3.	6.	923.	12.	6.	1087.			2010.	12.	6.	1278.	13.	2.

ete Taluk, Mysore District for the year 1888-89. Survadhare

Balance:-			Total:-			Expenditure.			Details of Expend
Current.									
897.	5.	8.	2096.	3.	6.	140.	1.	5.	75-"-" Agents pay
	"	"	3.	4.					30-14-" Hémagiry
	"								Swamy's Ra
	6.	8.		14.	10.				17-7-4. Shanbogue's
49.	13.	6.	126		8.				1-8-" Contingenci
									15-4-1. Talavar's pa
									140-1-5.
947.	9.	10.	2226.	7.		140	1.	5	

Sub: Division o

French Rocks

iture.	Remarks:-
r.	Details of this Balance are given in the Statement
ssued Ramans	for "Virodhi" 1889-90.
ttoksharam.	
pay.	
es.	
y.	

u

fficer.

(31 a)

Statement Shewing Receipts and

No:	Items:-	Demand (Jamabundy.)								
		Balance at the end of March 1889.			Jamabundy for 1889-90.			Total:-		
1.	Land.	2096.	3.	6.	1896.			3992.	3.	
2.	Amaraje.	3.	4.	..	5.	1	..	8.	5.	
3.	Inolaturfa.	..	..	..	3.	..	..	3.	..	
4.	Hullbunni.	..	14.	10.	1	..	..	1.	14.	
5.	Tax.	126.	..	8.	119.	9.	7.	245.	10.	
6.	Miscellaneous.	..	..	..	19.	11.	2.	19.	11.	
7.	Water cess.	..	..	..	5.	..	..	5.	..	
	Total.	2226.	7.	..	2049.	5.	9.	4275.	12.	9

Camp Mandya
Dated 10th March
1892

...ements of Muddika Yaslimanhalli Krishnarajpete J

Collection.										
Arrears.			Current.			Total:-			Arrears.	
1596.	9.	10.	1074.	15.	11.	2671.	9.	9.	499.	9.
..	4.	1.	5.	1.	...	5.	5.	1.	2.	15.
..	..	..	1.	..	...	1.	..	...	..	..
..	14.	10.	..	9.	..	1.	7.	10.	..	..
59.	4.	3.	88.	10.	11.	147.	15.	2.	66.	12.
...	...	..	18.	2.	8.	18.	2.	8.	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	...	..	...	...	...	..
1657.	1	..	1188.	7.	6.	2845.	8.	6.	569.	6.

rluk, Mrypac District, for the year 1889-90. "Virodhy":-

Balance:-										
	Current.			Total:.			Expenditure.			Details of Expenditure:-
8.	821.	..	1.	1320.	9.	9.	1564.	7.	4.	120-"-.. Agents pay.
11.	..	..	..	2.	15.	11.				30-14-.. Hemagiri Venkat Ramanasu "Rattokslavarum."
..	2.	..	..	2.	..	..				10-11-11. Talvaris pay.
..	..	7.	..	..	7.	..				1283-3-8. contributions.
										119-9-9. Tax.
										1564-7-4.
5.	30.	14.	8.	97.	11.	1.				
..	1.	8.	6.	1.	8.	6.				
..	5.	..	..	5.	..	..				
..	860	14.	3.	1430.	4.	3.	1564.	7.	4.	

Sub: Division officer
Tuticorin Rolls.

Remarks:-

* Total Balance
1430-4-3

1186-"-2. Recovered till the End of March 1891.

Balance:- 244-4-1.

Particulars of this Balance

x 169-10-1. Misappropriated by Shanboque and Botail.
correspondence is going on.

x 118-10-1. amount produced by defaulter Venket Ramaniah, and Kept in deposit. out of "this Butta" amount, Shanboque misappropriated some amount. on a report to "Huzur" orders have been issued to prosecute the man criminally. A man will soon be deputed to do the needful.

x 51-"-"- This amount relates to the correspondence which discloses that the Botail collected the amount giving to "Koolas Hubbi" and this amount, the Botail deposed, was given by him to the Shanboque. This correspondence is included with the above correspondence.

169-10-1.

Deducting this, amount to be collected is 74-10-"-!-

72-10-" amount Details of Kandayum due by Shanboque Keppanaik. For this sum his land is attached Sheikda is ordered to send the correspondence.

2-"-"- amount to be collected. Sheikdar is ordered to collect the amount.

74-10-"

Serial 6 (24) 23

Section Misc
File No 30 of 1890
Serial No 6

Read -

Petition dated 2[0] Decr. 1890, no: 2243 from Venkata Narna Chetty Vakildar of the Main village of Melkalli Krishnarajpet Taluk, Mysore District.

Correspondence ending with docket dated 21st March 1892, no: 1139, from the Dy Com: Mysore Govt: Pro: Dated 17th Jany 92 no: 3793-3802 * Cir: 67

* Rem: Mis 140/1888-89 Sec S

Order thereon - No 115-66 dated 3-1-93
No Dis 7. 241-92.

The Petitioner Venkata Narnabhatta complains that agent Venkatramanaya of Yachamanahalli, Melkalli

and their village has kept him out of accounts, has deceived him by giving him false accounts & has not been discharging the duties satisfactorily

2 With a view to facilitate the collection of the Contribution money payable by the holders of Poonkalli & their means village towards the upkeep of the Kenaipi Channel, the main village of Yackamanakalli was placed under Govt management in 1867. The Counter-Petitioner Venkatramayya, who is one of the Puttidars, was appointed agent in 1876 of Yackmanakalli Melkalli & their main village with the consent of the remaining Puttidars

3. The Dyfaur reports that

by Government

N.A.C. Venkoy

Submitted -

All the Ver: records are not in this branch. The available Ver records do not say anything about the subject of this appeal. But in the appeal Petn it is clearly stated that the agent was appointed by

the Jamabendi of Yachamanahalli, which is under Govt: management is done properly every year, that the other Inam villages are entirely under the management of the Inamdars and that in their interest the present agent who has not acquitted himself properly in the discharge of his duties should be removed from office.

4 With his docket no: 530 dated 26th: October 1889 the Dy:nr submitted statements shewing the Demand Collectn: balance for the village of Yachamanahalli from the year 1866-67 to the year 1887-88 inclusive. Similar statements for the subsequent years 1888-89 & 1889-90 have now been furnished. The Opening balance in the statement of 1888-89 does not tally with the closing balance of 1887-88. Between them there is a difference of Rs 452 as shewn in the margin. From the remarks made in the statement

1887-88 Closg Bal - 1750
1888-89 Opg Do 2202
Diff 452

2. For 1889-90 the Shanbhog & the Patel appear to have misappropriated certain sums of money

5. The village being under Govt management the former agent must act in subordination to Govt officers. The proper accounts must be kept & passed by the Rev. officers of Govt. & they will be open to the inspection of the Collectors at stated hours. The difference in the accounts pointed out above calls for early explanation & the Dep.t Com.r is requested to submit a further & early report on the subject

Chief Secretary

Draft.
31.12.92 No. 11566
Pet. Fi. 241-92

To The Dy Com.r
Mysore District

First -
The Petn is referred to the Dy Com.r whose orders have been issued.

31.12.92

Draft
28-12
6-1-93

Dr. C.S.
Secl.
Draft for GV
=
31/12/92

Asst Secretary
Revenue Office
Mysore

No. 2243-

Section

File No

Serial No

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
3rd January 1893.

Endorsement granted to Venkata Ramana Bhatta, Vaitikar of the Inam village of Melkalli, Krishnarajpet Taluq in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2243 dated 2nd December 1890

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner by whom orders have been issued

"By Order,"

Re Draft

Chief Secretary.

Issued 16/1/93.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000